

1 Dale K. Galipo, Esq., #144074  
dalekgalipo@yahoo.com  
2 Shannon J. Leap, Esq. #339574  
sleap@galipolaw.com  
3 **LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO**  
21800 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 310  
4 Woodland Hills, CA 92367-6479  
Telephone: (818) 347-3333  
5 Facsimile: (818) 347-4118

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff V.L., by and through the Guardian  
Ad Litem Amber Snetsinger, individually and as successor-  
in-interest of JOHNNY RAY LLAMAS, deceased

7 Garo Mardirossian, Esq., #101812  
garo@garolaw.com  
8 Lawrence D. Marks, Esq., #153460  
Lmarks@garolaw.com  
9 **MARDIROSSIAN AKARAGIAN, LLP**  
6311 Wilshire Boulevard  
10 Los Angeles, CA 90048-5001  
Telephone (323) 653-6311  
11 Facsimile (323) 651-5511

12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs S.L., by and through the Guardian  
Ad Litem Kristine Llamas Leyva, and as successor-  
13 in-interest of JOHNNY RAY LLAMAS, deceased; and  
CAROLYN CAMPBELL, individually  
14

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
16 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

17 S.L., by and through the Guardian Ad  
Litem Kristine Llamas Leyva; V.L., by  
18 and through the Guardian Ad Litem  
Amber Snetsinger; and as successors-in-  
19 interest of JOHNNY RAY LLAMAS,  
deceased; and CAROLYN  
CAMPBELL, individually,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 vs.

22 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE;  
23 RIVERSIDE COUNTY SHERIFF  
DEPARTMENT, public entities; and  
24 DOES 1 through 10, individually and as  
peace officers, inclusive,

25 Defendants.  
26  
27  
28

CASE NO. 5:24-cv-00249-CAS-SP

**JOINT SCHEDULING CONFERENCE  
REPORT**

**Operative Complaint:** February 1, 2024

**Responsive Pleading:** March 4, 2024

**Trial (Proposed):** September 30, 2025

1           **JOINT RULE 26(f) REPORT FOR THE SCHEDULING CONFERENCE**

2           Following meeting and conferring of counsel pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil  
3 Procedure Rule 16(b), the parties hereby submit their Joint Rule 26(f) Report for the  
4 Scheduling Conference pursuant to the Court's Order dated April 4, 2024 (Dkt. No. 21),  
5 and pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26(f).

6           Plaintiff V.L. will appear through her counsel of record, Dale K. Galipo of the Law  
7 Offices of Dale K. Galipo. Plaintiffs S.L. and Carolyn Campbell will appear through their  
8 counsel of record, Garo Mardirossian and Lawrence Marks of Mardirossian Akaragian,  
9 LLP. Defendant County of Riverside, will appear through their counsel of record, Eugene  
10 Ramirez and Lynn Carpenter.

11           **A. BRIEF STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

12           *1. Plaintiff's Statement:*

13           On April 14, 2023, at approximately 4:45 p.m., Defendant Deputies, Does 1-10,  
14 encountered Johnny Ray Llamas, decedent ("Mr. Llamas") at or near the 22000 block of  
15 River Road in the unincorporated area of Perris, known as Meadowbrook, County of  
16 Riverside, State of California. At all relevant times, Mr. Llamas posed no imminent threat  
17 of death or serious bodily injury to defendants or any other person. Even though Mr.  
18 Llamas posed no imminent or immediate threat of death or serious bodily harm to  
19 Defendants or anyone else, Defendant Deputies used excessive force upon Mr. Llamas,  
20 shooting him in the back and shooting him again after he had fallen to the ground after  
21 being shot in the back. Defendant Deputies had less than lethal alternatives available to  
22 them and failed to utilize, let alone exhaust these less lethal options prior to using deadly  
23 force. Mr. Llamas died of his injuries.

24           *2. Defendants' Statement:*

25           On April 14, 2023, members of the Riverside County Sheriff's Department Special  
26 Enforcement Bureau's Fugitive Warrant Team (FWET) were actively searching for a  
27 known individual, Johnny Llamas, who had multiple outstanding felony warrants. At  
28 about 1553 hours, Sheriff's Dispatch received information that Llamas was at 27080

1 Highway 74 and had arrived in a stolen vehicle, a blue Chevrolet Tahoe. SEB and FWET  
2 deputies responded to the area along with deputies assigned to the Gang Task Force and  
3 Perris patrol. While developing a plan, Llamas left the location in a vehicle and deputies  
4 attempted to catch up to him. Llamas evaded deputies and they eventually lost sight of  
5 him. At about 1647 hours, Sheriff's Dispatch received a suspicious person call in the area  
6 of 22305 River Rd. The reporting party saw a male, matching Llamas' description, and a  
7 female running away from a grey pick up. Deputies responded to this area, set a perimeter,  
8 and began a search for several hours and were unable to locate Llamas. At about 1917  
9 hours, K9 Rudy entered a tree line area, and deputies nearby heard a gunshot. K9 Rudy  
10 was unresponsive and did not return to his handler, leading deputies to believe he had  
11 been shot.

12 The Sheriff's Department helicopter went overhead and located Llamas and a female,  
13 later identified as Priscilla Raju, running from the tree line. Llamas was armed with a  
14 handgun and held it to his head and placed the gun in his mouth at various points as he ran.  
15 Llamas ran to River Rd., crossed the street, and entered a property located at 22240 River  
16 Rd. While on this property, a deputy involved shooting occurred. Llamas fell to the ground  
17 and was taken into custody. Paramedics arrived quickly, due to being staged nearby,  
18 checked Llamas' vital signs, and ultimately pronounced him deceased on scene.

## 19 **B. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

20 This Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343(a)(3)-  
21 (4) because Plaintiffs assert claims arising under the laws of the United States including 42  
22 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States  
23 Constitution. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims arising under  
24 state law pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), because those claims are so related to the federal  
25 claims that they form part of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United  
26 States Constitution.

## 27 **C. LEGAL ISSUES**

28 The following are among the principal issues raised by Plaintiffs' Complaint:

- a) Whether Defendant Deputies used excessive force under the Fourth Amendment;
- b) Whether the excessive force against Decedent interfered with Plaintiffs' right to a familial relationship with Decedent;
- c) Whether the use of excessive force against Decedent was malicious, oppressive, or in reckless disregard of his rights;
- d) Whether Defendant Deputies unreasonably denied medical care to Decedent under the Fourth Amendment;
- e) Whether the Riverside County Sheriff's Department has unconstitutional policies, practices, or customs that were the cause of Decedent's and Plaintiffs' injuries;
- f) Whether the Riverside County Sheriff's Department failed to adequately train its officers;
- g) Whether Riverside County Sheriff's Department Deputies unreasonably denied medical care to Decedent under the Fourth Amendment;
- h) Whether the Defendant Deputies were negligent with respect to their handling of the situation, pre-shooting tactics, and the use of force;
- i) Whether Defendants violated the Bane Act by using excessive force;
- j) Whether Plaintiffs are entitled to damages; and
- k) The nature and extent of Plaintiffs' and Decedent's damages, including wrongful death damages, survival damages, and punitive damages,

#### **D. PARTIES AND EVIDENCE**

Plaintiffs S.L. and V.L. are Decedent's minor children, and Plaintiff Carolyn Campbell is Decedent's natural mother. Defendants are the County of Riverside and various unnamed Doe defendants.

Other witnesses and/or individuals with information pertinent to this matter may

1 become known throughout the discovery process.

2 Plaintiffs' claimed damages include compensatory damages in an amount according  
3 to proof, including damages for pre-death pain and suffering, survival damages, wrongful  
4 death damages; funeral and burial expenses; treble damages; and punitive damages.  
5 Plaintiffs also seek statutory attorney's fees and costs, including interest.

6 Defendant denies the nature and extent of plaintiffs' claimed damages.

#### 7 **E. INSURANCE**

8 The County of Riverside is permissibly self-insured per California Government  
9 Code § 990.

#### 10 **F. MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

11 The parties do not consent to a magistrate judge from the court's Voluntary Consent  
12 List to preside over this action for all purposes, including trial.

#### 13 **G. DISCOVERY PLAN**

14 The parties have begun discovery at the time of the drafting of this report. The  
15 parties will made initial disclosures two weeks following the Early Meeting of Counsel,  
16 on April 24, 2024. There are no anticipated issues about discovery of electronically stored  
17 information. The Parties have filed a stipulated protective order. The Parties propose a fact  
18 discovery cutoff date of **March 21, 2025**.

19 The Parties propose an Expert Disclosure cut-off of **April 4, 2025**.

20 The Parties propose a Rebuttal Expert Disclosure date of **April 25, 2025**.

21 The Parties propose an expert discovery cut-off date of **May 16, 2025**.

22 All parties respectfully request that trial documents be due on or before **August 22, 2025**.

#### 23 **1. Plaintiffs**

24 Plaintiffs have propounded written discovery on Defendants including a request for  
25 production seeking the materials pertaining to the investigation into this incident.  
26 Plaintiffs anticipate deposing individual defendant deputies whose identities will become  
27 known through Defendants' initial disclosures. Plaintiffs may also depose EMTs,  
28 paramedics, and/or fire department personnel who arrived to provide medical attention to

1 Decedent. Plaintiffs may also depose a person most knowledgeable regarding the  
2 Riverside County Sheriff's Department's policies, procedures, and training pertaining to  
3 the use of force, including use of lethal force.

4 Subjects on which plaintiffs claim discovery may be needed include: deputies'  
5 training; deputies' prior uses of force, if any, including citizens' or internal complaints  
6 made against the deputies; Riverside County Sheriff's Department policies; the handling  
7 of evidence by Riverside Sheriff's Department employees; medical treatment provided to  
8 the decedent at the scene of the incident; and observations of the involved deputies and  
9 other witnesses.

## 10 2. Defendant

11 Defendant intends to propound written discovery regarding Decedent's and  
12 Plaintiffs' medical and mental health history, Decedent's criminal history, Plaintiffs'  
13 requested damages and their calculation of damages, and discovery related to witnesses  
14 that may have knowledge regarding the incident at issue in the operative Complaint.  
15 Defendant anticipates taking the depositions of the Plaintiffs, percipient witnesses, and  
16 expert witnesses to the extent appropriate. There may be additional issues that arise in the  
17 course of this litigation that defendant may also explore through discovery.

18 The parties will also take the depositions of any experts or witnesses identified by  
19 the other. The parties do not anticipate any changes to the limitations on discovery  
20 imposed by the Federal Rules at this time, except that the parties may seek a stipulation or  
21 leave to depose more witnesses than the 10 allowed under the Federal Rules.

## 22 **H. MOTIONS**

23 Plaintiffs anticipate filing either a motion to amend or a stipulation to amend current  
24 claims, add additional claims, and name additional currently unidentified deputies once  
25 such identities and factual information become available through discovery. Plaintiffs are  
26 hopeful that such amendment may be accomplished through stipulation. Depending on  
27 evidence and facts learned through discovery, there may be additional procedural motions  
28 that need to be filed.

1 Plaintiffs propose a deadline to file motions to amend the pleadings of April 14,  
 2 2025, consistent with the two-year statute of limitations outlined in Cal. Civ. Proc. Code  
 3 Section 335.1. Defendants propose a deadline to file motions to amend the pleadings of  
 4 **November 15, 2024.**

5 The Parties propose a deadline to hear motions of **June 16, 2025.**

6 Defendants anticipate filing a motion for summary judgment, including on the  
 7 grounds of qualified immunity for the deputy defendants.

8 All parties anticipate filing motions *in limine* if this matter proceeds to trial.

9 The parties expect to file discovery motions as needed or to seek Magistrate assistance  
 10 via information discovery conference; pretrial motions *in limine*.

#### 11 **I. CLASS ACTIONS**

12 Counsel agree that this matter is not a class action.

#### 13 **J. DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS**

14 Defendants anticipate filing a Motion for Summary Judgment with respect to all or  
 15 some of Plaintiffs' claims at the close of discovery. If Defendants file a Motion for  
 16 Summary Judgment, Plaintiffs Request two weeks to file their opposition. Plaintiffs have  
 17 no objection to Defendants' request to have two weeks to file their reply.

#### 18 **K. SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE/ ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION** 19 **(ADR)**

20 The parties have not yet engaged in any settlement discussions or communications.  
 21 The parties' preference is to engage in these discussions through the Court's ADR Panel  
 22 Mediation program with a mutually-agreed upon Panel Mediator.

#### 23 **L. PRETRIAL CONFERENCE AND TRIAL**

24 The parties propose a Pretrial Conference date of **September 8, 2025** and a Trial date of  
 25 **September 30, 2025.**

#### 26 **M. TRIAL ESTIMATE**

27 The parties have requested trial by jury and estimate the length of the trial at  
 28 approximately 5-7 days. Plaintiffs contemplate calling 8-10 witnesses. Defendants



1 contemplate calling 10-15 witnesses. Due to the number of witnesses the parties intend to  
 2 call, it is likely that the trial will exceed four court days.

3 **N. TRIAL COUNSEL**

4 Dale K. Galipo will be lead trial counsel for Plaintiff V.L. and Garo Mardirossian  
 5 and Lawrence Marks will be lead trial counsel for the Plaintiffs S.L. and Carolyn  
 6 Campbell.

7 Trial counsel for Defendants are Eugene Ramirez and Lynn Carpenter.

8 **O. INDEPENDENT EXPERT OR MASTER**

9 Counsel agree that neither a discovery master, nor independent scientific expert are  
 10 needed for this lawsuit.

11 **P. MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATIONS**

12 Counsel agree that this is not a case which is sufficiently complex to be governed by  
 13 the procedures of the federal “Manual for Complex Litigation.”

14 **Q. OTHER ISSUES**

15 Defendant anticipates seeking an order bifurcating determination of liability for  
 16 compensatory damages from *Monell* liability and punitive damages if this matter proceeds  
 17 to trial.

18  
 19 Respectfully Submitted,  
 20 DATED: May 16, 2024

The Law Offices of Dale K. Galipo  
 MARDIROSSIAN AKARAGIAN, LLP

21  
 22 By: /s/ Shannon J. Leap

23 Dale K. Galipo  
 24 Garo Mardirossian  
 25 Lawrence D. Marks  
 26 Shannon J. Leap<sup>1</sup>  
 27 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

28 <sup>1</sup> As the filer of this document, I attest that all other signatories listed, and on whose behalf the filing is submitted, concur in the filing’s content and have authorized the filing.



1  
2 DATED: May 14, 2024

**MANNING & KASS**  
**ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP**

3  
4  
5 By: /s/ Kayleigh A. Andersen  
6 Eugene P. Ramirez  
7 Lynn L. Carpenter  
8 Kayleigh Andersen  
9 Attorneys for Defendant, COUNTY OF  
10 RIVERSIDE  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28